UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,360	07/26/2001	In-Gwang Kim	11349-P66932US0	6934

7590 06/28/2004

JACOBSON, PRICE, HOLMAN & STERN
PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER	
ROSWELL, MICHAEL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	3

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/912,360	KIM, IN-GWANG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Roswell	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 September 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 5 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims recite the term "repeating server". The term is not sufficiently well known in the art or defined in the specification, and is therefore subjected to broad interpretation. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

3. Regarding claims 1 and 4, the claims recite the limitation "discussing the contents of the remote control through a chatting unit", which fails to be enabling due to the fact that no parties were specified in the discussion process.

4. Regarding claims 5 and 7, a "waiting room of a chatting unit" is not sufficiently well known in the art or described in the specification in such a way as to be enabling of one skilled in the art.

5. Claims 2 and 6 are dependent upon rejected base claims and are subsequently rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al (U.S. Patent 6,633,905), hereinafter Anderson.

7. Regarding claims 1 and 4, Anderson shows, at a remote control server, providing a remote control program to a client computer (taught as the use of a remote access engine through "KEY-VIEW II", at col. 1, lines 58-67), allowing a client computer to connect to a remote server based on a user identification and password (taught as the use of a login screen for remote access, at col. 50, lines 13-19), and performing the remote control of a client computer after discussing contents of the remote control through a chatting unit (taught as the use of a "Switch Modules sub-menu" for displaying all contents of a remote control, at col. 51, lines 30-36).

8. Regarding claims 5 and 7, Fig. 28 shows the Keyview PC attached to multiple Host PCs, and is thus able to provide a remote control program to a client computer (taught as the use of a remote access engine through "KEY-VIEW II", at col. 1, lines 58-67), allow client computers to connect to a remote server based on a user identification and password for each (taught as the use of a login screen for remote access, at col. 50, lines 13-19). Anderson further allows for remote PCs to access the Keyview PC through the Internet or a LAN to control other Host PCs,

taught at col. 46, lines 28-38, and form a connection by way of an Internet Address, or IP address, at col. 3, lines 47-49.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2, 3, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Hoffert et al (U.S. Patent 5,046,119), hereinafter Hoffert.

10. Regarding claims 2 and 6, Anderson teaches monitoring a change on a display of a server and transmitting a coordinate value of the change to a processing unit (taught as the transmission of exact X and Y coordinates from a KEY-VIEW PC to a Host PC, at col. 66, lines 38-43), generating an image based on the coordinate value of change (taught as the conversion of an analog video signal of a Host PC to digital form, at col. 2, lines 28-34), compressing and transmitting the image (taught as the reduction of the video from RGB 8-8-8 format to RGB 5-5-5 format, at col. 32, lines 13-18), transmitting a keyboard/mouse event generated in the remote control server to a data transmitting/receiving unit (taught as the transmission of mouse data to a Host PC, which in receiving the data and transmitting its video data acts as a transmitting/receiving unit, at col. 66, lines 38-43), transmitting files necessary for the remote control to the data transmitting/receiving unit (taught as the installation of a KEY-VIEW II mouse driver on a Host PC, at col. 65, lines 52-57), and transmitting control data to the client computer (inherently taught as the Host PC is the transmitting/receiving unit).

Anderson, however, fails to explicitly teach the use of bitmap images to reflect the video input of KEY-VIEW II.

Hoffert teaches a compression and decompression method for video data such as the video data used by Anderson.

Hoffert also teaches the use of bitmap images for video data, taught as the encoding of 4 x 4 pixel data into a 16-bit bitmap, at col. 1, lines 32-36.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anderson and Hoffert before him at the time of the invention was made to combine the Host PC video monitoring and remote control unit of Anderson with the bitmap video encoding of Hoffert in order to obtain a remote PC control unit capable of representing video data in compressed bitmap format.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the obvious advantage of memory conservation through data compression and greater video performance. See Hoffert, col. 1, lines 48-61.

11. Regarding claim 3, Anderson teaches monitoring a change on a display of a server and transmitting a coordinate value of the change to a processing unit (taught as the transmission of exact X and Y coordinates from a KEY-VIEW PC to a Host PC, at col. 66, lines 38-43), generating an image based on the coordinate value of change (taught as the conversion of an analog video signal of a Host PC to digital form, at col. 2, lines 28-34), compressing the image (taught as the reduction of the video from RGB 8-8-8 format to RGB 5-5-5 format, at col. 32, lines 13-18), transmitting a keyboard/mouse event generated in the remote control server to a data transmitting/receiving unit (taught as the transmission of mouse data to a Host PC, which in receiving the data and transmitting its video data acts as a transmitting/receiving unit, at col.

66, lines 38-43), transmitting files necessary for the remote control to the data transmitting/receiving unit (taught as the installation of a KEY-VIEW II mouse driver on a Host PC, at col. 65, lines 52-57), and transmitting control data to the client computer (inherently taught as the Host PC is the transmitting/receiving unit). Anderson also teaches performing the remote control of a client computer after discussing contents of the remote control through a chatting unit (taught as the use of a "Switch Modules sub-menu" for displaying all contents of a remote control, at col. 51, lines 30-36).

Anderson, however, fails to explicitly teach the use of bitmap images to reflect the video input of KEY-VIEW II.

Hoffert teaches a compression and decompression method for video data such as the video data used by Anderson.

Hoffert also teaches the use of bitmap images for video data, taught as the encoding of 4 x 4 pixel data into a 16-bit bitmap, at col. 1, lines 32-36.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anderson and Hoffert before him at the time of the invention was made to combine the Host PC video monitoring and remote control unit of Anderson with the bitmap video encoding of Hoffert in order to obtain a remote PC control unit capable of representing video data in compressed bitmap format.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the obvious advantage of memory conservation through data compression and greater video performance. See Hoffert, col. 1, lines 48-61.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The reference pertains to the remote control of personal computers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is (703) 305-5914. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Roswell
6/17/2004

CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER